## **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-28 are pending. Claims 15, 17, 21, 23 and 25-27 are amended. No new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 15, 21, and 25 were objected to; and Claims 15-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Talpade</u> (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0148520, hereafter "<u>Talpade</u>") in view of <u>Mollenkopf</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,980,090).

Initially, it is believed that amendments to Claims 15, 21, and 25 address the informalities identified in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claims 15, 21, and 25 be withdrawn.

As to the rejection of Claims 15-28 as being unpatentable over <u>Talpade</u> in view of <u>Mollenkopf</u>, Claim 15 is amended to recite, , *inter alia*, a system for protecting a communication device against a denial-of-service attack that includes:

a monitoring device provided on a local area network including the communication device, the monitoring device being configured to monitor a packet transmitted to the communication device via an internet-service-provider network; and

wherein the monitoring device includes

a protection-request-information transmitting unit configured to transmit to the restricting device protection request information indicating a request for protection against the attack, the protection request information including a certificate authenticating the monitoring device, the protection-request-information transmitting unit being configured to update the protection request information to exclude from restriction packets not included in the attack, based on a report transmitted from the restricting device... (Emphasis added.)

Turning to the primary reference, <u>Talpade</u> describes a system for detecting and mitigating service attacks using a sensor, an analysis engine and one or more filter routers. 

Talpade describes that the sensor (234) monitors all traffic entering customer networks (204, 206) from the ISP network (202) through edge routers (226, 228). 

The sensor (234) transmits an indication of an attack to an analysis engine (232), which configures one or more of the filter routers (230) to advertise new routing information to each border and edge router (220, 222, 224, 228) directing all traffic to the filter router (230) for filtration. 

Talpade also describes that packets that do not form part of the attack are forwarded to their original destination. 

describes that packets that do not form part of the attack are forwarded to their original destination.

However, <u>Talpade</u> does not describe that the sensor (234) transmits a certificate, much less that the sensor (234) transmits a certificate along with the indication of the attack.

Instead, <u>Talpade</u> describes the communication between the sensor (234) and the analysis engine (232) is performed through IPSec tunnels that are manually or automatically established. Therefore, it is believed that <u>Talpade</u> fails to disclose the protection-request-information transmitting unit as recited in amended Claim 15, and <u>Mollenkopf</u> does not cure this deficiency in <u>Talpade</u>. Accordingly, no combination of <u>Talpade</u> and <u>Mollenkopf</u> describe every feature recited in amended Claim 15, and amended Claim 15 is believed to be in condition for allowance, together with any claim depending therefrom.

Moreover, amended Claims 21 and 25 recite features substantially similar to those recited in amended Claim 15, and are believed to be in condition for allowance, together with any claim depending therefrom, for substantially similar reasons. Accordingly, it is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Talpade at paragraphs 8 and 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Talpade at paragraph 17; see also Figure 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Id.

<sup>4 &</sup>lt;u>Id</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Talpade at paragraph 23.

Application No. 10/579,891

Reply to Office Action of November 25, 2009

respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be

withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in

the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal

allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 15-28 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/09) James J. Kulbaski Attorney of Record Registration No. 34,648

Aldo Martinez Registration No. 61,357